

Application No.: 09/940,321
Amendment Dated: November 28, 2006
Reply to Final Office Action of: August 28, 2006

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-10, 13-19 and 21-23 are pending in the application. By the foregoing amendment, claims 1, 9 and 19 have been amended. In view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks urged here, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5, 7-10, 13-14, 16, 18-19, 21 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fu in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20020116541A to Parker et al. (“Parker”). The Examiner has rejected claims 15, 17 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fu and Parker and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,631,402 to Devine et al. (“Devine”).

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-10, 13-14, 16, 18-19, 21 and 23:

Applicants have amended claims 1, 9 and 19 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the “display time zone is established by receiving a message from a source external to said handheld computer indicating that a time zone change has occurred and an input from a user confirming said change in time zone, said message displayed to said user only when a second time zone received from said external source is different from said first time zone.” Claim 9 has been amended to recite the step of establishing “a display time zone by receiving a message from a source external to said handheld computer indicating that a time zone change has occurred and an input from a user confirming said change in time zone, said message displayed to said user only when a second time zone received from said external source is different from said first time zone.” Claim 19 has been amended to recite the step of establishing “a display time zone by receiving a message from a source external to said handheld computer indicating that a time zone change has occurred, and receiving an input from a user confirming said change in time zone, said message displayed to said user only when a second time zone received from said external source is different from said first time zone.”

Application No.: 09/940,321
Amendment Dated: November 28, 2006
Reply to Final Office Action of: August 28, 2006

Among the problems the present invention is intended to solve is the problem of synchronizing start and end times of calls and meetings so that start and end times can be displayed as local time or the time at some arbitrary time zone. As such, the present invention proposes, *inter alia*, receiving a message from a source external to the handheld computer which is displayed to the user only when the time zones (one indicated on the handheld computer and one indicated by the external source) do not match. The user then confirms the time zone change so that the handheld computer is synchronized to the local time zone or some arbitrary time zone (see Specification page 11, lines 5-9).

The Examiner's base reference, Fu is directed to scheduling and tracking events across multiple time zones where a personal information manager automatically set its local time to a new time zone via conventional broadcasted reference signals. Fu does not teach or suggest receiving a message from a source external to the handheld computer which is displayed to the user only when the time zones do not match.

The shortcomings of Fu are not overcome by Parker nor is Parker cited for such teachings. Parker is directed to optimizing user notifications for small computing devices. However, Parker does not teach or suggest receiving a message from a source external to the handheld computer which is displayed to the user only when the time zones do not match.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that any combination of Fu and Parker does not teach or suggest every claimed feature of the invention. The prior art reference (or references) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Since a prima facie case of obviousness has not been set forth, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 9 and 19 are allowable over the cited references. Claims 2-3, 5, 7-8, 10, 13-14, 16, 18, 21 and 23, by their dependency on claims 1, 9 and 19, are similarly allowable. Early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Claims 15, 17 and 22:

Applicants have amended claims 9 and 19 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. In particular, claim 9 has been amended to recite the step of establishing "a display time zone by receiving a message from a source external to said handheld computer indicating that a time zone change has occurred and an input from a

Application No.: 09/940,321
Amendment Dated: November 28, 2006
Reply to Final Office Action of: August 28, 2006

user confirming said change in time zone, said message displayed to said user only when a second time zone received from said external source is different from said first time zone.”

Claim 19 has been amended to recite the step of establishing “a display time zone by receiving a message from a source external to said handheld computer indicating that a time zone change has occurred, and receiving an input from a user confirming said change in time zone, said message displayed to said user only when a second time zone received from said external source is different from said first time zone.”

Among the problems the present invention is intended to solve is the problem of synchronizing start and end times of calls and meetings so that start and end times can be displayed as local time or the time at some arbitrary time zone. As such, the present invention proposes, *inter alia*, receiving a message from a source external to the handheld computer which is displayed to the user only when the time zones (one indicated on the handheld computer and one indicated by the external source) do not match. The user then confirms the time zone change so that the handheld computer is synchronized to the local time zone or some arbitrary time zone (see Specification page 11, lines 5-9).

The Examiner’s base reference, Fu is directed to scheduling and tracking events across multiple time zones where a personal information manager automatically set its local time to a new time zone via conventional broadcasted reference signals. Fu does not teach or suggest receiving a message from a source external to the handheld computer which is displayed to the user only when the time zones do not match.

The shortcomings of Fu are not overcome by Parker or Devine, nor are Parker or Devine cited for such teachings. Parker is directed to optimizing user notifications for small computing devices. However, Parker does not teach or suggest receiving a message from a source external to the handheld computer which is displayed to the user only when the time zones do not match. Devine is directed to a network based reporting system for customers. However, Devine does not teach or suggest receiving a message from a source external to the handheld computer which is displayed to the user only when the time zones do not match.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that any combination of Fu and Parker does not teach or suggest every claimed feature of the invention. The prior art reference (or references)

Application No.: 09/940,321
Amendment Dated: November 28, 2006
Reply to Final Office Action of: August 28, 2006

must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Since a prima facie case of obviousness has not been set forth, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 9 and 19 are allowable over the cited references. Claims 15, 17 and 22, by their dependency on claims 9 and 19, are similarly allowable. Early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner enter the Amendment after Final and reconsider all presently outstanding rejections. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative if an interview might expedite allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

BERRY & ASSOCIATES P.C.



Dated: November 28, 2006

By: _____
Bosco Kim
Registration No. 41,896

Berry & Associates P.C.
9255 Sunset Boulevard
Suite 810
Los Angeles, CA 90069
(310) 247-2860